2/25/70

Dear Howard,

Your fat envelope postmarked 23 arrived.

2/18 to Dick: Lets wait until yout slides of 399 are back. I'll not likely want slides. I plan to make new pictures of my own. But I will want to see. I'm sorry if I forgot to send a set of my Bishop notes to Dick. In my own time and way, I will be applying a little intellectual Judo with Bishop as the aggressive force and will keep you both informed. My panel letter: thus far I've heard from only Fisher. Because of my scant supply of special paper, I did not make a xxxy copy for anyone but Paul, who can copy cheapest. Dick will send you one. I am delaying my response, but I do like his letter. The machine to which I took this and other things for copying broke immediately, so I couldn't do it then. Sorry for the trouble this made for you. I asked you because you can Thermofax for 2¢.

2/8-ypur comment on my Bishop notes (I'm reading and repkying in a single operation, so some of my observations may be premature. If you plan writing about Bishop at all, I simply must tell you of my spontaneous "Night In the Life of Jim Bishop", written on camera 10/66. Maybe 9/66. For them moment it is sufficient for you to know he knew better. I have the reports on the Connally fragments getting to the police....My standing caution on Tink. If there was a fragment removal from the chest, as cleansing alone might have accomplished, there remained on to be recorded in post-operative X-rays ordered by Shires. This is in WW. I believe, from memory, the citation is 6H111. If you want to go into LHO's clothes, make notes and take it up when you are here again. This fiction caused a considerable amount of foolish improvisation by the police. They'd have been clobbered on this had there been a court case. Your comment on 410 is within reason but, in my opinion, not within probability. However, if you want to find another significance. reread my handling of the Siberto'Neill report in WWII. I suggest holding off on writing Bishop until I do other things first. You'll know when I do. If we have to refer to this again, I'm filing under Bishop. I would suggest you ask before doing anything with what is in my memo, for I may have other things in mind.

My returned memo on the N.O. transcripts, these two things: this morning I sent the transcripts themselves to Hoch, who will be spreading them around as people ask. I doubt if they are worth your time. But they will be available. Also, I am not at all confident these are the only transcripts the office got. That was one of the reasons for the list to them. There was a considerable problem rounding them up for copying for me. At some point, if they do not think of it themselves, I'll suggest that they consult the court reporter's bill, which should tell them which they have.

2/16 to me: camera shutter: these are not made for intensive copying. I've ruined one that way. They can be used, naturally, for taking pictures, but they will not hold up to a solid day of use, for example.

MacNeil and Allman: it has yest to be established that this was Oswald. I'll show you what I have from MacNeil on this when you are here. Ask yourself xxxx if the lawyers would not have used something better than Baker if they could, or if they would not have stretched him more than they did, had they dared.

I do not have "Lee". Robert is a fink. He was bought within a week, and I have the suppressed proof of it. Perhaps someone will come accross a remaindered copy some day and send it to me....What he did to his brother is little to what he did to his mother. Remember the biblical injunction...

2/18, to me. The question you pose about whether Specter could have committed a crime is more complicated than you seem to realize, for this wes not in a

court of law. The lawyer is always an agent of the court, but is he in such a proceeding? You also must consider whether he jurged himself of responsibility by reporting it, say to Rankin. I doubt if any lawyer can give you an unequivocal answer. It is not a uncommon for lawyers to adduce diametretically opposite testimony from witnesses. Here you have to consider whether each is sincerely and honestly repeating his observations or opinions, which would eliminate perjury, I think, and get into the area of human error. Are you lily-gilding? I have already established that he, consciously, adduced perjurious testimony. This is a crime. Now if he led Shaneyfelt into giving testimony he knew to be perjrious, that is a crime. But remember all the conditions you would have to meet: that Specter knew better than his expert, that he deliberately led his expert to lie about a material thing under oath, that S did, in fact, lie, and not merely get ambiguous, etc. If one establishes Specter committing a crime, you still have the mouse problem, how the hell do you get the bell on the cat? Who is going to prosecute him? My solution was to challenge him to sue me for libel when I published these charges againsthhim. I encourage you to hold off on any public accusations of any kind, against Specter or anyone else, until Dick and I, at the least, have had a chance to go over them and then, if we feel you may be on solid ground, until after you take this up with your father and his lawyer, for he is legally responsible for you.

2/18, with 2/2 to Moritz and his 2/10 response: On the comtrary, this is a very significant letter. Think of what transpired between your letter to him and this response. Like me and DJ.

2/23, to me. I have no immediate need for any of these pictures, but if and when you make copies, I'd like one of each. I think the position of the hole as measured onx the cadaver should be more clearly marked on your patient dad's back and that you here have duplicated only half of what I have told you. The other half is the same thing either erect or sitting. The pictures are enclosed

2/19, memo "Autopsy Measurements of JFK Back Wound". One major omission is what I have earlier called to your attention: the lengths of the respective necks. I think this can be a material variation. Second, you should, at the very least, have cocked the head to the left also, unless you know the position at thetime of measurement. Or did you without telling me? Possibly the cast of the shoulders could also be significane, say an inch or so. And whether or not eitther was raised or lowered. Remember what the radiologist with whom I consulted about this told me: the scapula is the lostingest bone in the body. To a degree you have compensated by using a shorter measurement, but this, in turn, can cause a different dostortion. I now see you did make the marks I suggested, but they do not show in the pictures. Let me make this suggestion if you do this again, one that comes to mind immediately: use a notebook-paper reinforcement, with the hole of the doughnut centered over the spot. With the hair on your dad's back, this will show (if it sticks). And I thinkthe measurements are greater than would be typical. I think by a third, anyway.

Now we are heregetting into a ticklish area, and I think it best that we discuss it. What you are doing is duplicating my work. Under some considerations this is fine and proper. However, if it is for any use, it may not be. One is that, because the only <u>known</u> work in this area is so besmudged with the most egregious error (Gorman's), it causes no concern. I am extremely anxious not to attract any unnecessary attention to the much more solid work I've completed and to what I am still working on in the same area. Therefore, for the moment, I want you not to have anyone but Dick in on this. If you recall what I showed you on your second visit in addition to what I showed you the first, you should recall two thingsL progress and new leads tok be followed. I am working on these, as best I can. I

also plan other, besides public, uses, and there, too, I want unanticipated. One, as you know, is in court (the draft of the first complaint is done, but it does not deal with this and is incomplete). Then, of course, there is the use in my own writing,mfrom which I do not want the edge removed.

It is a relatively simple matter to duplicate the work of others in non-fiction. But, unauthorized, it is wrong, morally I suggest being more importantly than legally. You are partially familiar with the problem of Nichols and the impending harm plus damage. Collaborators working in the same filed should help each other, to help achieve a common end, to help with each other's understanding, to facilitate the acquisition of more information. Butw when one begins the use of the material of others, the situation changes to that of counter-productivity. Then each collaborator asks himself, consciously, subconsciously but necessarily can I safely do this? Should I? You see where this leads? How it interfers with work?

If you are not careful, you will find yourself in Tink's position, and that you must avoid. There is an enormous amount of work to be done in this field. There is, likewise, an enormous amount of duplication, much not avlidable. However, each should seek to stick to his own, toemphasize his own, nott to rephrase or duplicate that of others.

One of the possible non-publication hazards may be the ordering of new 399 base pictures. This may attract enough attention to what I have been seeking to accomplish for several years to frustrate it. Or, it may get the Archives to the point where they say they have enough pictures and will take no more-use what we have-as they have done with me on th shirt. I think, also, that you should assume the requests some of us make are carefully gone over by those whose interests are not scholarly and whose knowledge of the fact of the case and evidance is not at all amateur. This makes it tough enough. Have you any immediate need for these pictures? It is two months since I asked them about this and I have yet yo get an answer. You think this is accidental? I do not. Same on shirt-slit enlargements. I am persuaded my work here is solid and I think it should be left alone until I have finished with it, in both cases. In fact, in all the cases I showed you.

I've gotta get to other things. Thanks for the mailings. If you have any questions about the above, why not take it up with Dick? He is busy at the moment, but none of it is of instant urgency. In time he'll be able to respond.

Best regards,

2/25/70

Dear Howard,

Your fat envelope postmarked 23 arrived.

2/18 to Dick: Lets wait until yout slides of 399 are back. I'll not likely want slides. I plan to make new pictures of my own. But I will want to see. I'm sorry if I forgot to send a set of my Bishop notes to Dick. In my own time and way, I will be applying a little intellectual Judo with Bishop as the aggressive force and will keep you both informed. My panel letter: thus far I've heard from only Fisher. Because of my scant suply of special paper, I did not make a xxy copy for anyone but Paul, who can copy cheapest. Dick will send you one. I am delaying my response, but I do like his letter. The machine to which I took this and other things for copying broke immediately, so I couldn't do it then. Sorry for the trouble this made for you. I asked you because you can Thermofax for 2¢.

2/8-ypur comment on my Bishop notes (I'm reading and repkying in a single operation, so some of my observations may be premature. If you plan writing about Bishop at all, I simply must tell you of my spontaneous "Night In the Life of Jim Bishop", written on camera 10/66. Maybe 9/66. For them moment it is sufficient for you to know he knew better. I have the reports on the Connelly fragments getting to the police....My standing caution on Tink. If there was a fragment removal from the chest, as cleansing alone might have accomplished, there remained on to be recorded in post-operative X-rays ordered by Shires. This is in WW. I believe, from memory, the citation is 6Hlll. If you want to go into LHO's clothes, make notes and take it up when you are here again. This fiction caused a considerable amount of foolish improvisation by the police. They'd have been clobbered on this had there been a court case. Your comment on 410 is within reason but, in my opinion, not within probability. However, if you went to find another significance. reread my handling of the Gibert-O'Neill report in WWII. I suggest holding off on writing Bishop until I do other things first. You'll know when I do. If we have to refer to this again, I'm filing under Bishop. I would suggest you ask before doing anything with what is in my memo, for I may have other things in mind.

My returned memo on the N.O. transcripts, these two things: this morning I sent the transcripts themselves to Hoch, who will be spreading them around as people ask. I doubt if they are worth your time. But they will be available. Also, I am not at all confident these are the only transcripts the office got. That was one of the reasons for the list to them. There was a considerable problem rounding them up for copying for me. At some point, if they do not think of it themselves, I'll suggest that they consult the court reporter's bill, which should tell them which they have.

2/16 to me: camera shutter: these are not made for intensive copying. I've ruined one that way. They can be used, naturally, for taking pictures, but they will not hold up to a solid day of use, for example.

MacNeil and Allman: it has yest to be established that this was Oswald. I'll show you what I have from MacNeil on this when you are here. Ask yourself xxxx if the lawyers would not have used something better than Baker if they could, or if they would not have stretched him more than they did, had they dared.

I do not have "Lee". Robert is a fink. He was bought within a week, and I have the suppressed proof of it. Perhaps someone will come accross a remaindered copy some day and send it to me....What he did to his brother is little to what he did to his mother. Remember the biblical injunction...

2 Cincl Meeting

court of law. The lawyer is always an agent of the court, but is he in such a proceeding? You also must consider whether he jurged himself of responsibility by reporting it, say to Rankin. I doubt if any lawyer can give you an unequivocal answer. It is not a uncommon for lawyers to adduce diametretically opposite testimony from witnesses. Here you have to consider whether each is sincerely and honestly repeating his observations or opinions, which would eliminate perjury, I think, and get into the area of human error. Are you lily-gilding? I have already established that he, consciously, adduced perjurious testimony. This is a crime. Now if he led Shaneyfelt into giving testimony he knew to be perjrious, that is a crime. But remember all the conditions you would have to meet: that Specter knew better than his expert, that he deliberately led his expert to lie about a material thing under oath, that S did, in fact, lie, and not merely get ambiguous, etc. If one establishes Specter committing a crime, you still have the mouse problem, how the hell do you get the bell on the cat? Who is going to prosecute him? My solution was to challenge him to sue me for libel when I published these charges againsthhim. I encourage you to hold off on any public accusations of any kind, against Specter or anyone else, until Dick and I, at the least, have had a chance to go over them and then, if we feel you may be on solid ground, until after you take this up with your father and his lawyer, for he is legally responsible for you.

2/18, with 2/2 to Moritz and his 2/10 response: On the contrary, this is a very significant letter. Think of what transpired between your letter to him and this response. Like me and DJ.

2/23, to me. I have no immediate need for any of these pictures, but if and when you make copies, I'd like one of each. I think the position of the hole as measured onx the cadaver should be more clearly marked on your patient dad's back and that you here have duplicated only half of what I have told you. The other half is the same thing either erect or sitting. The pictures are enclosed

2/19, memo "Autopsy Measurements of JFK Back Wound". One major omission is what I have earlier called to your attention: the lengths of the respective necks. I think this can be a material variation. Second, you should, at the very least, have cocked the head to the left also, unless you know the position at thetime of measurement. Or did you without telling me? Possibly the cast of the shoulders could also be significane, say an inch or so. And whether or not either was reised or lowered. Remember what the radiologist with whom I consulted about this told me: the scapula is the lostingest bone in the body. To a degree you have compensated by using a shorter measurement, but this, in turn, can cause a different dostortion. I now see you did make the marks I suggested, but they do not show in the pictures. Let me make this suggestion if you do this again, one that comes to mind immediately: use a notebook-paper reinforcement, with the hole of the doughnut centered over the spot. With the hair on your dad's back, this will show (if it sticks). And I thinkthe measurements are greater than would be typical. I think by a third, anyway.

Now we are heregetting into a ticklish area, and I think it best that we discuss it. What you are doing is duplicating my work. Under some considerations this is fine and proper. However, if it is for any use, it may not be. One is that, because the only <u>known</u> work in this area is so besmudged with the most egregious error (Gorman's), it causes no concern. I am extremely anxious not to attract any unnecessary attention to the much more solid work I've completed and to what I am still working on in the same area. Therefore, for the moment, I want you not to have anyone but Dick in on this. If you recall what I showed you on your second visit in addition to what I showed you the first, you should recall two things: progress and new leads to be followed. I am working on these, as best I can. I

also plan other, besides public, uses, and there, too, I want unanticipated. One, as you know, is in court (the draft of the first complaint is done, but it does not deal with this and is incomplete). Then, of course, there is the use in my own writing,mfrom which I do not want the edge removed.

It is a relatively simple matter to duplicate the work of others in non-fiction. But, unauthorized, it is wrong, morally I suggest being more importantly than legally. You are partially familiar with the problem of Nichols and the impending harm plus damage. Collaborators working in the same filed should help each other, to help achieve a common end, to help with each other's understanding, to facilitate the acquisition of more information. Butw when one begins the use of the material of others, the situation changes to that of counter-productivity. Then each collaborator asks himself, consciously, subconsciously but necessarily can I safely do this? Should I? You see where this leads? How it interfers with work?

If you are not careful, you will find yourself in Tink's position, and that you must avoid. There is an enormous amount of work to be done in this field. There is, likewise, an enormous amount of duplication, much not avlidable. However, each should seek to stick to his own, toemphasize his own, nott to rephrase or duplicate that of others.

One of the possible non-publication hazards may be the ordering of new 399 base pictures. This may attract enough attention to what I have been seeking to accomplish for several years to frustrate it. Or, it may get the Archives to the point where they say they have enough pictures and will take no more-use what we have-as they have done with me on th shirt. I think, also, that you should assume the requests some of us make are carefully gone over by those whose interests are not scholarly and whose knowledge of the fact of the case and evidance is not at all amateur. This makes it tough enough. Have you any immediate need for these pictures? It is two months since I asked them about this and I have yet yo get an answer. You think this is accidental? I do not. Same on shirt-slit enlargements. I am persuaded my work here is solid and I think it should be left alone until I have finished with it, in both cases. In fact, in all the cases I showed you.

I've gotta get to other things. Thanks for the mailings. If you have any questions about the above, why not take it up with Dick? He is busy at the moment, but none of it is of instant urgency. In time he'll be able to respond.

Best regards,